

ANN M. KLEIMOLA

**PLUS ÇA CHANGE: THE SHAPING OF EARLY MUSCOVITE  
DIPLOMATIC RITUALS<sup>1</sup>**

This study examines the diplomatic rituals and ceremonies employed in formal exchanges of envoys between Muscovy and the Grand Principality of Lithuania in the late fifteenth century and first decades of the sixteenth and also analyzes the application of parallel procedures in the reception of messengers conveying “private” letters between Lithuanian lords (*pany*) and Moscow boiars. The concerns for honor, precedence, and control of information, as well as the manner of negotiating, all so evident in the seventeenth century, were well established by the 1530s, if not earlier. At the same time the “private” contacts, orchestrated behind the scenes by the sovereigns and their official representatives, offered more flexibility and provided a “back channel” for keeping communications open without loss of face.

*keywords: early Muscovite diplomacy, Grand Principality of Lithuania, Radziwill, Fedorov Cheliadnin, Ovchina Telepnev Obolenskii*

Ann M. Kleimola—PhD, Professor Emerita of History at the University of Nebraska. Email: rintintin996@yahoo.com. ORCID: 0009-0008-8931-0561

---

1 Citation: A. M. KLEIMOLA, “*Plus ça change: The Shaping of Early Muscovite Diplomatic Rituals*”, *RussianStudiesHu* 7, no. 2 (2025): 201–211. DOI: 10.38210/RUSTUDH.2025.7.20

A major focus of the “new diplomatic history” is analysis of the forms that came to govern how envoys conducted their activities in the Early Modern period. As Hennings and Sowerby point out in introducing an anthology on the topic, the essays “build on the premise that sociocultural practices constituted political relationships, that they were not the consequence of foreign policy, international law, and political thought but their basis, and that a study of these practices reveals more about the nature of early modern diplomacy than the assumptions that underlie the traditional state-focused, Eurocentric paradigm.”<sup>2</sup> In the conduct of negotiations, the actions and responses of the actors had immediate impact, as each party attempted to press its arguments while simultaneously safeguarding the honor of the sovereign. Each stage of an embassy’s progress (arrival, lodging, initial reception with presentation of credentials and gifts, ceremonial banquet, negotiations, resolution (or not) of issues, departure) offered its own context of symbolic communication. Location, rank of participants, and gestures all mattered.<sup>3</sup>

The “new diplomatic history” has “shifted the perspective away from the study of great—essentially European—affairs, and the modern state-focused notion of international relations, to a broader appreciation of cross-cultural exchange, individual actors, and the complexity of early modern polities in the evolution of diplomatic practice.”<sup>4</sup> Most studies of Early Modern Russian diplomatic practice have examined the slow transition toward more modern “state”-centered approaches and integration with European norms from the late 17<sup>th</sup> century on. In contrast to the 19<sup>th</sup> c., diplomacy in 17<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> c. Europe was not yet conducted “between states” but between ‘sovereigns or people with status equal to that of a sovereign’; not within an abstract international system, but “within the society of princes.”<sup>5</sup> Russia was a courtly society that shared in many of the same concepts of honor and precedence as the European community. At the same time we

---

2 JAN HENNINGS, TRACEY A. SOWERBY (eds.), “Introduction: Practices of Diplomacy,” in *Practices of Diplomacy in the Early Modern World c. 1410–1800* (London and New York: Routledge, 2017), 2.

3 HENNINGS, SOWERBY, “Introduction,” 4.

4 JAN HENNINGS, *Russia and Courtly Europe: Ritual and the Culture of Diplomacy, 1648–1725* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 4. On Russian practice, see MARIA A. PETROVA, “The Diplomatic Service in Early Modern Russia,” in *Early Modern European Diplomacy: A Handbook*, ed. DOROTHÉE GOETZE, LENA OETZEL (Oldenbourg: De Gruyter, 2024), 271–90. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110672008-014>

5 CHRISTIAN WINDLER, “Afterword: From Social Status to Sovereignty—Practices of Foreign Relations from the Renaissance to the *Sattelzeit*,” in *Practices*, 256.

must note that the essential structural elements of these courtly practices were already clearly in place in the Muscovy of the early sixteenth century, so had deeper roots than has often been acknowledged.

For the first decades of the sixteenth century the question of relations with the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was one of the dominant preoccupations of Muscovite military and diplomatic policy. The two states had conflicting claims to the West Russian borderlands but were very different polities. Lithuania was a multi-ethnic and multi-confessional state bound to Poland through a dynastic union, with strong West European cultural influences, entrenched regional interests, and political power increasingly flowing into the hands of the aristocrats in the Sejm. Moscow, in contrast, was completing the process of “gathering the Russian lands” under its control, dealing with the successors of the Golden Horde as the Tatar Yoke ended, subordinating the elite as part of laying the foundations of autocracy, and championing its role as leader and defender of the Orthodox world in the wake of the Turkish conquest of Byzantium. From the 1490s on, open military hostilities on the Russian-Lithuanian front were tempered by periods of relative peace, punctuated by border raids and repeated rounds of diplomatic negotiations aimed at working out a peace treaty or at least a truce.

An examination of their diplomatic interactions during this period reveals that well before the mid-century establishment of the Posol’skii prikaz (Ambassadorial Chancellery) the functions that it later supervised were already deeply embedded in the fabric of the emerging bureaucratic culture. Local officials notified Moscow when an embassy arrived at the border; assigned escorts (*pristavy*) then accompanied the diplomats to Moscow, where they most often were housed “across the river” in Dorogomilovo. Both on the road and in the capital their “minders” provided protection but also ensured that the foreigners would remain in their quarters and have no contact with outside society. When summoned to the Kremlin, the envoys were greeted by *pristavy* of increasingly higher rank at each stage of their procession to their audience with the Grand Prince, where they presented their credentials (*veriushchie gramoty*), exchanged salutations, presented their gifts, and read their prepared introductory remarks (*nakaznye rechi*) on behalf of their overlord. A ceremonial banquet, with seating by precedence, ended with their being dispatched to quarters accompanied by courtiers bearing drink. Subsequent negotiations between the envoys and boiars took place without the presence of the ruler. Whatever the outcome, after being dismissed by the sovereign, the

envoys headed to the border under the guard of their escort. From arrival to departure, the Lithuanian representatives and their party enjoyed food, lodging, and transport courtesies of the Moscow government.

Notions of hospitality, reciprocal bonds, and honor were already built into the rituals of formal Muscovite diplomacy by the early sixteenth century, many already attested in Ivan III's reign. And relationships of another sort reflect even more clearly that these ritual procedures were regarded as the normal way of "doing business." The surviving chancellery records preserve several sets of what appear on the surface to be "private letters" between highly placed courtiers on each side, written on their own initiative<sup>6</sup>: Lord Ian Zaberezhskii of Polotsk and Iakov Zakhar'ich, boyar and namestnik of Novgorod, later in Moscow, 1492-1493<sup>7</sup>, 1501;<sup>8</sup> boyar Ivan Iur'evich Patrikeev and Nikolai Nikolaevich Radziwill in Vilnius, 1492-1494;<sup>9</sup> Patrikeev and Zaberezhskii, 1492-1493;<sup>10</sup> boiar Grigorii Fedorovich Davydyov-Cheliadnin and the Lithuanian chancellor, Nikolai Radziwill, 1520-1521;<sup>11</sup> and boiar Ivan Fedorovich Ovchina Telepnev Obolenskii and Radziwill's son Iurii Nikolaevich in 1535-1536.<sup>12</sup> In cases where official negotiations broke down or the sides were at war and the ruler considered it "unseemly" (*neprigozhe*) to be the first to reach out, the situation allegedly prompted the supposed author of the letter to contact a counterpart on the other side to join in urging the sovereigns to work toward peace, brotherhood, and an end to the shedding of innocent Christian blood. While such missives have been seen as examples of a presumed traditional right of leading boyars to communicate independently,<sup>13</sup> in the cases of correspondence cited here the sovereign was clearly the wizard behind the

6 The idea possibly originated in Lithuania; see ROBERT M. CROSKY, *Muscovite Diplomatic Practices in the Reign of Ivan III* (New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1987), 143-45, and MARIUS SIRUTAVIČIUS, "Between the East and the West: The Evolution of Diplomacy in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and Poland," in *Early Modern European Diplomacy*, 382-83. Unfortunately, we do not have correspondingly early Russian documentation.

7 *Сборник императорского русского исторического общества* [далее СИРИО] 35 (Санкт-Петербург, 1882), Nos. 17, 20.

8 СИРИО 35, Nos. 67, 68, 69.

9 СИРИО 35, Nos. 17, 22, 23, 24.

10 СИРИО 35, Nos. 18, 19.

11 СИРИО 35, Nos. 86-89.

12 СИРИО 59 (Санкт-Петербург, 1887), Nos. 3-5; *Акты, относящиеся к истории Западной России, Собранные и изданные Археологической комиссией II* [далее АЗР] (Ст. Петербург, 1846), No. 175.

13 М. М. Кром, «Вдовствующее царство»: *Политический кризис в России 30-40-х годов XVI века* (Москва: Новое литературное обозрение, 2010), 159.

curtain, and the ensuing exchanges became part of the diplomatic record. Employing this strategy, Ivan III not only timed Iakov Zakhar'ich's reply to Zaberezhskii but sent the text of the reply to be copied by Iakov's *d'iak*.<sup>14</sup> Similarly, in 1519 after inconclusive military operations Vasilii III wanted to restart negotiations and instructed boiar Davydov to write a personal letter and send his "man" (*chelovek*) Boris Kamenskii to deliver it to Nikolai Radziwill in Vilnius.<sup>15</sup> Davydov was clearly acting under orders. Yet both polities maintained the pretence that this was merely a personal contact.

These "private" letters offer little specific about the issues to be negotiated, tending instead to focus on the nuts-and-bolts arrangements that had to be made, such as the issuing and transfer of safe-conduct passes for envoys and the dates at which the next diplomatic mission would arrive. The authors were intermediaries charged with keeping communication open, not formulators of policy. As Radziwill put it in the spring of 1520 when trying to obtain safe-conduct passes so that negotiations could proceed, "You ask your sovereign and I will ask mine."<sup>16</sup> These practical matters were embedded in seemingly endless repetitions of hopes for peace or at least a truce, expressions of good will on the part of their sovereigns, the desire that no more Christian blood be spilled, and the need for both states to live in peace and quiet so as to protect Christendom from the forces of Islam (*besermenstvo*).<sup>17</sup>

In the absence of an established postal system, the authors entrusted the delivery of their letters to their "men,"<sup>18</sup> who travelled with diplomatic delegations when possible, but on occasion took to the road together, when one was returning home and the other was conveying a response. Some internal references in the documentation suggest that they were literate. There are copies of memoranda (*pamiati*) addressed to the messengers, giving them instructions, texts of the speeches they are to present upon arrival, or what response to give if asked various questions.<sup>19</sup>

14 СИРИО 35, No. 17

15 СИРИО 35, No. 86, 548.

16 СИРИО 35, No. 86.6.

17 The language in the letters from both sides is remarkably similar. See, for example, the draft of a letter from a Lithuanian lord to a Moscow boiar, tentatively attributed to Iurii Nikolaevich Radziwill; «1535 (?) Ян. 6. Отрывок черного наброска послания одного из панов-рады некоему московскому боарину,» in М. М. Кром, *Радзивилловские акты из собрания Российской национальной библиотеки: первая половина XVI века* (Москва, Варшава: Древлехранилище, 2002), No. 53.

18 Usually identified as a *chelovek* or *sluga*.

19 СИРИО 35, No. 6; AZR II, No. 175.XVI, XVIII.

Boris Kamenskii himself sent a letter to Davydov explaining why he had been delayed in Lithuania and reporting that Radziwill had asked him to write Davydov so he would not worry.<sup>20</sup>

From the frontier check point on the messengers were subject to procedures, rituals and ceremonies that paralleled those accorded to diplomats. The authorities on both sides recognized the intelligence-collecting possibilities inherent in these exchanges and took steps to preclude any opportunities for such activity. Escorts accompanied the messengers to Moscow, making sure that they had no contact with local inhabitants.<sup>21</sup> They were provided with “minders” at their lodging, usually at Dorogomilovo. The Lithuanians took similar precautions. When Davydov’s man had to wait for Radziwill’s return, he was lodged in one of the chancellor’s villages nine miles from Vilnius.<sup>22</sup> Such concern was well-founded. In a memorandum to his man, Davydov instructed him to find out who the envoys to Moscow would be and when they would arrive, along with gathering what information he could about Lithuanian dealings with the Crimean Tatars and the Teutonic Knights.<sup>23</sup> Memoranda (*pamiati*) addressed to other messengers outline what they should attempt to find out about the other country’s plans or diplomatic maneuvering with other states, what to say in response to questions, or how they should behave so as to overhear as much as possible without calling attention to themselves.<sup>24</sup>

The messengers, as “unofficial” contacts, were not summoned to the Kremlin, but to a meeting with the addressee of the letter they carried. Accompanied each step of the way by a series of escorts, they were announced, exchanged salutations, presented *pominki* (gifts) from their masters and themselves, delivered the letter, and attended a banquet after the audience. At a farewell reception the host usually announced that his man would be carrying his reply, departing with the returning messenger.

The same series of activities was expected in Vilnius. In February 1536 Ovchina gave his man Iakov Snozin a memorandum on how to handle his mission to Radziwill. He was to exchange salutations, give the prepared speech, ask about Ovchina’s cousin Fedor Vasil’evich (then a prisoner of war

---

20 СИРИО 35, No. 86.

21 СИРИО 35, No. 86.IV.

22 СИРИО 35, No. 86.X.

23 СИРИО 35, No. 86.IX.

24 СИРИО 35, Nos. 17, 20.

in Lithuania), present *pominki* from Ovchina and himself, use the following answers to any questions about Kazan', the Mordva and Cheremis, Crimea, the Nogai, and Wallachia. If not asked about those matters, "don't talk."<sup>25</sup>

As was the case with reception of diplomats, the Grand Prince had his representatives present at these meetings.<sup>26</sup> When Davydov was ordered to meet with Radziwill's messenger in March 1520, the sovereign dispatched his courtier I. Iu. Shigona Podzhogin and two secretaries (*d'iaki*), Men'shoi Putiatin and Trufan Il'in, to attend. Davydov ordered the court secretary (*dvortsovyi d'iak*) Iurii Lelechin to take the letter.<sup>27</sup> He thus had witnesses that he had not received anything in secret or altered the content of the message while simultaneously preserving his status as one who delegated paperwork to functionaries. Shigona Podzhogin and the secretaries Men'shoi Putiatin and Fedor Mishurin appeared in the same roles at the audience of Iurii Radziwill's messenger Gaiko/Ganko in 1536.<sup>28</sup> Bureaucratic officials were generally present for audiences and reception banquets both official and unofficial, and thus provided a link of institutional memory.

The "combination of gift and hospitality" that Arel finds "at the very heart of the ambassadorial ritual" in the seventeenth century<sup>29</sup> was already evident in Muscovite-Lithuanian relations at least as early as 1492, when Ivan III ordered Iakov Zakhar'ich to send his man to Ian Zaberezhskii with *pominki*, "you know what would be appropriate."<sup>30</sup> Gifts were most often precious items (gold and silver objects, expensive cloth, arms)<sup>31</sup> and animals, especially, as was the case in the early modern period generally, those "suitable for riding, the hunting field, and racing remained central to royal gifting throughout most of the early modern period."<sup>32</sup> The Davydov-Radzi-

25 СИРИО 59, No. 3.VII.

26 And they had other duties—in 1501 Sumorok Putiatin and undersecretary Olekseiko Malyi were part of the group that brought Ian Zaberezhskii's man Ondreika Lozka to Dorogomilova and remained with him; СИРИО 35, no. 68.

27 СИРИО 35, No. 86.V.

28 СИРИО 59, No. 3; AZR II, No. 175.

29 MARIA SALOMON AREL, "Hospitality at the Hands of the Muscovite Tsar: The Welcoming of Foreign Envoys in Early Modern Russia," *The Court Historian* 21 (2016): 24.

30 СИРИО 35, No. 17.

31 E.g., СИРИО, 35, Nos. 20, 86.V, 88.IX; AZR II, No. 17. In 1535 Gaiko brought a length of scarlet (luxury woolen broadcloth) from Radziwill and crimson patterned Venetian silk from himself; СИРИО 59, 3.II.

32 FELICITY HEAL, "Presenting Noble Beasts: Gifts of animals in Tudor and Stuart diplomacy," in *Practices*, 190.

will exchanges in 1520–1521 offer a tantalizing glimpse of private interests. Davydov sent his man Kost'ia back with Lithuanian envoys in September 1520, conveying a letter and falcons.<sup>33</sup> While there Kost'ia had passed on to Radziwill Davydov's interest in acquiring breeding stock.<sup>34</sup> Radziwill's man Gaiko, arriving with Nikolai Shestov's embassy that winter, delivered a letter with a notation that Radziwill had filled Davydov's "shopping list." Gaiko brought with him the requested ambler colt, ungelded, some fine woolen cloth (*sharlata*) and a pair of the Polish scenthounds noted for rabbit hunting (*ogar' i ogaritsa*).<sup>35</sup> The request for rabbit hunters makes sense in the context of the court, given Vasilii III's enthusiasm for the sport and delight in the success of his hounds as described in Herberstein's account.<sup>36</sup> Gaiko in turn took home items Radziwill had requested, a male sighthound (*pes borzoi*), a dog used for falconry (*sobaka podsokol'ia*), and a gyrfalcon.<sup>37</sup> Fifteen years later, when Gaiko returned to Moscow as Iurii Radzivil's messenger, his party on the trip home included one of Ovchina's men entrusted with delivering a gift of falcons to Radzivil.<sup>38</sup>

The ceremonial banquets provided a setting where honor and hospitality met. Foreign envoys, and their counterpart private messengers, sat in the place of honor at the table opposite the sovereign or host. When such a reception could not be offered, there was a proxy alternative, for example, in the case of the very young Grand Prince Ivan IV, who in August 1536 apologized to the Lithuanian envoys that it would not be seemly for him to be at the table, since he was "still a minor (*da eshche esmia lety nesovershenny*)," but he would send food from his own table to them at their lodgings.<sup>39</sup> Fine dishes and drink, carried through the streets under the direction of a courtier who made them wait to dine until he had conveyed the Grand Prince's best wishes and then joined them, demonstrated

33 СИРИО 35, No. 88

34 СИРИО 35, No. 88.IX.

35 СИРИО 35, No. 89.VIb.

36 СИГИЗМУНД ГЕРБЕРШТЕЙН, *Записки о Московии* (Москва: Издательство Московского университета, 1988), 220–22. Vasilii's rabbit hounds are also featured in the only sixteenth-century hunting scenes depicted in the *Illustrated Chronicle Compilation*; for the facsimile edition, see *Лицевой летописный свод XVI века. Русская летописная история*, Е. Н. КАЗАКОВА и др. (ред.), 24 vols. (Москва: Актеон, 2009–2010), available online at <https://runivers.ru/lib/book19785>, here 19:242, 244–45.

37 СИРИО 35, No. 89.VIb. The few later references we have to breeding stock tend to use *kobel'* and *suka* to designate breeding stock; see *Словарь русского языка XI–XVII вв.*, вып. 7 (Москва: Наука, 1980), 208.

38 СИРИО 59, Nos. 3, 4.I.

39 AZR II, No. 175.

the majesty of the ruler. As Herberstein had commented, crowds of spectators were valuable “to show foreigners the prince’s power.”<sup>40</sup>

Denial of such rituals was a response to injured honor. In general the Russians wanted to have the conclusion of serious negotiations happen in Moscow, with the other side represented by a high-level embassy headed by a ranking aristocrat connected to the court.<sup>41</sup> In the winter of 1521, for example, Vasilii III summarily sent a formal delegation home. The diplomats had been trying to arrange safe-conduct passes for envoys, and the Grand Prince declared that instead of the proposed envoys the king should send “great people” from the Olel’kovich clan, and from the Radziwills and the Zaberezh’skiis. The diplomats were not invited to a royal banquet or given *pominki*. They were transferred from Dorogomilovo to Semchinskoe sel’tso (current area of Khamovniki), where they were guarded by four officials and 30 grooms (*koniukhi*) to make sure they spoke to no one before being sent back.<sup>42</sup> To agree completely with the proposals of the other side was dishonorable; thus in the 1522 truce negotiations the original Lithuanian proposal for ten years was bargained down to five.<sup>43</sup> In 1532 there was a dispute over Lithuanian envoys attaching their seals to a document because it was “unseemly” for their seals to be opposite that of the Grand Prince.<sup>44</sup>

Arel also notes that it would have been “dishonorable and insulting” to the ruler if a foreign envoy refused to “accept the Tsar’s generosity.”<sup>45</sup> We find a striking example in 1537, when the king’s envoys came to Moscow for the first time since Vasilii III died. Lords Ian Iur’evich Glebovich, Matei Voitekhovich, and secretary Ventslav Nikolaev, all Catholics, and two courtiers came in a party of 415 Lithuanians and 611 horses. They were housed in Dorogomilovo, guarded by 60 *deti boiarskie* per shift. After the usual formalities negotiations began, and by the end of January an “eternal peace” agreement was out of sight but a truce perhaps possible. Following another week of fractious discussion, the Grand Prince ordered that their *pominki* be returned. The envoys declared to their court *pristav* that they had come in good faith, bringing gifts appropriate to the honor of both rulers: “Not taking our gifts is an insult . . . Take your sovereign’s largesse

40 ГЕРБЕРШТЕЙН, *Записки*, 212.

41 On Muscovite diplomatic practices, see DANIEL C. WAUGH, INGRID MAIER, *Cross-Cultural Communications in Early Modern Russia: Foreign News in Context* (Seattle and Uppsala: Research Works, University of Washington Libraries, 2023), Ch 4.

42 *SIRIO* 35, no. 89; for Gaiko’s 1535 reminiscence about this, see *SIRIO* 59, No. 3.IV.

43 *SIRIO* 35, No. 93.

44 *SIRIO* 35, No. 111.

45 AREL, “Hospitality,” 32.

(*zhalovan'e*) and cart it away! We came not to get maintenance but to negotiate." Their *pristav* replied that it would it be unseemly for him to do so. And the Grand Prince sent his own response: "Take care of business or don't, the sovereign grants his largesse: that upholds the honor of the sovereigns." (*podelaetsia li delo, ne podelaetsia li, i gosudar' pozhaluet svoim zhalovan'em: to gosudarei chin derzhat*). They finally reached a deal, but only after another ten days of furious argument and a Lithuanian threat to depart immediately.<sup>46</sup> More questions of honor and precedence, of course, arose in connection with sealing the agreement.

As Hennings points out, whether in Europe or in Russia, upholding honor was "more than an expression of vain formality, personal pride, or self-worth." In his view it was a "constitutive component" of the Early Modern state's "sovereignty and legitimacy."<sup>47</sup> And for Muscovy this was true before the *gosudarstvo* became a state. Each step in the requisite rituals and ceremonies was well choreographed at an early date. The "private" letters had a separate but parallel choreography. They offered a flexible tool for keeping negotiations open under conditions that made it impossible for sovereigns to compromise their honor by direct contact. They served as a back channel of communication, conveying requests or proposals without either sovereign having to take direct responsibility. By the time of its establishment in the mid-sixteenth century the *Posol'skii prikaz* inherited an entrenched set of rules and notions governing the conduct of diplomacy which had worked well for decades and would continue to operate in the following centuries.

## References

*Akty, otnosiashchiesia k istorii Zapadnoi Rossii. Tom Pervyi, 1340–1506.* [Acts Relating to the History of Western Russia. Volume I. 1340–1506.] (Sankt-Peterburg: Arkheograficheskaia Kommissiia, 1846)

MARIA SALOMON AREL, "Hospitality at the Hands of the Muscovite Tsar: The Welcoming of Foreign Envoys in Early List of Modern Russia," *The Court Historian* 21 (2016): 23–43. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14629712.2016.1170539>

ROBERT M. CROSKY, *Muscovite Diplomatic Practices in the Reign of Ivan III* (New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1987).

S. GERBERSTEIN, *Zapiski o Moskovii* (Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta, 1988)

FELICITY HEAL, "Presenting Noble Beasts: Gifts of Animals in Tudor and Stuart diplomacy," in *Practices of Diplomacy in the Early Modern World c. 1410–1800*, JAN HENNINGS,

46 AZR II, No. 175.XIV-XXXVIII. Reminiscent of the British ambassador Carlisle's refusing departure gifts from the tsar and the tsar returning the gifts he brought; HENNINGS, *Russia*, 152–53.

47 HENNINGS, *Russia*, 3.

TRACEY A. SOWERBY (eds.) (London and New York: Routledge, 2017), 187–203. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315186375-11>

JAN HENNINGS, TRACEY A. SOWERBY, “Introduction,” in *Practices of Diplomacy in the Early Modern World c. 1410–1800*, JAN HENNINGS, TRACEY A. SOWERBY (eds.) (London and New York: Routledge, 2017), 1–22.

JAN HENNINGS, *Russia and Courtly Europe: Ritual and the Culture of Diplomacy, 1648–1725* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016).

M. M. KROM, *Radzivillovskie akty iz sobraniia Rossiiskoi natsional'noi biblioteki: pervaiia polovina XVI veka* [Radziwill Acts from the Collection of the Russian National Library: The First Half of the 16th Century] (Moskva – Varshava: Drevlekhranilishche, 2002)

M. M. KROM, «Vdovstvuiushchee tsarstvo»: *Politicheskii krizis v Rossii 30 – 40-kh godov XVI veka* [“The Widowing Tsardom”: Political Crisis in Russia in the 30s-40s of the 16th Century] (Moskva: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2010)

E. N. KAZAKOVA i dr. (red.), *Litsevoi letopisnyi svod XVI veka. Russkaia letopisnaia istoriia* [Illustrated Chronicle of the XVI Century. Russian Annalistic History] (Moskva: Akteon, 2009–2010)

M. A. PETROVA, “The Diplomatic Service in Early Modern Russia,” in *Early Modern European Diplomacy: A Handbook*, DOROTHÉE GOETZE, LENA OETZEL (eds.) (Oldenbourg: De Gruyter, 2024), 271–90. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110672008-014>

*Sbornik imperatorskago russkago istoricheskago obshchestva. Tom 35.* [Collection of the Imperial Russian Historical Society. Vol. 35] (Sankt-Peterburg: Tipografia F. Eleonskogo i K<sup>o</sup>, 1882)

*Sbornik imperatorskago russkago istoricheskago obshchestva. Tom 59.* [Collection of the Imperial Russian Historical Society. Vol. 59] (Sankt-Peterburg: pod redaktsiei G. F. Karpova, 1887)

MARIUS SIRUTAVIČIUS, (2024): “Between the East and the West: The Evolution of Diplomacy in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and Poland,” in *Early Modern European Diplomacy: A Handbook*, DOROTHÉE GOETZE, LENA OETZEL (eds.) (Oldenbourg: De Gruyter, 2024), 373–402. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110672008-019>

DANIEL C. WAUGH, INGRID MAIER, *Cross-cultural Communications in Early Modern Russia: Foreign News in Context* (Seattle – Uppsala: Research Works, University of Washington Libraries, 2023).

CHRISTIAN WINDLER, “Afterword: From Social Status to Sovereignty—Practices of Foreign Relations from the Renaissance to the *Sattelzeit*,” in *Practices of Diplomacy in the Early Modern World c. 1410–1800*, ed. JAN HENNINGS, TRACEY A. SOWERBY (London and New York: Routledge, 2017), 254–266.